UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/792,127	03/04/2004	Wen Tong	7000-611	3909
	7590 11/03/200 TERRANOVA, P.L.L.	EXAMINER		
100 REGENCY	FOREST DRIVE	BURD, KEVIN MICHAEL		
SUITE 160 CARY, NC 275	518		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2611	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			11/03/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/792,127	TONG ET AL.		
Examiner	Art Unit		
Kevin M. Burd	2611		

	Kevin M. Burd	2611	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the o	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED <u>20 October 2008</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS A			
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Apperfor Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:	the same day as filing a Notice of a replies: (1) an amendment, affidavieal (with appeal fee) in compliance	Appeal. To avoid abar t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request
a) The period for reply expires <u>4</u> months from the mailing date	of the final rejection.		
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(the content of the co	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth hter than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE	g date of the final rejection	n.
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	ension and the corresponding amount of hortened statutory period for reply origi	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Offic	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as
 The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed wi AMENDMENTS 	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	
3. X The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, b	out prior to the date of filing a brief	will not be entered be	031160
a) ∑ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, to (a) ∑ They raise new issues that would require further cor			cause
(b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below		1 2 201011),	
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in beti	•	ducing or simplifying th	ne issues for
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a c	corresponding number of finally reje	ected claims.	
NOTE: See Continuation Sheet. (See 37 CFR 1.1)	16 and 41.33(a)).		
4. \square The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12	21. See attached Notice of Non-Co	mpliant Amendment (I	PTOL-324).
5. 🔲 Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):			
 Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all _ non-allowable claim(s). 			
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		l be entered and an ex	xplanation of
Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: <u>5,13,14 and 44-47</u> .			
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-4,6-12,15-43 and 48-56</u> . Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but	before or on the date of filing a No	otice of Anneal will not	he entered
because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).			
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary 	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	al and/or appellant fails	s to provide a
10.	n of the status of the claims after er	ntry is below or attache	ed.
 The request for reconsideration has been considered but See Continuation Sheet. 	does NOT place the application in	condition for allowand	ce because:
12. ☐ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s). (13. ☐ Other:	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)		
	/Kevin M. Burd/ Primary Examiner, Art U	nit 2611	

Continuation of 3. NOTE: Claim 5 was indicated as allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. The after final amendment does not include all of these limitations. Additional claims are now dependent on claim 16 that were not previously dependent on this claim. This amendment raises new issues and required further consideration.

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The amendment to the claims would overcome the 112 rejection stated in the previous office action. Pursuant to 35 USC 112, 6th, the input means as stated in the claims is shown in the specification as a multiple antenna MIMO array receiving a plurality of input signals and inputting these received signals to a MIMO decoder as illustrated in the figures. Regarding the rejection of claims 16 and 17, the reference discloses the claimed limitations. Agrawal discloses the subgroups and the subset. Weighted signals are received. These signals are the subset. The weighted signals are received over communication channels. These channels are a subgroup. No clarification regarding the number of signals that constitue a subset and the number of channels that constitue a subgroup is recited in the claims. Regarding the rejections of claims 39, 50 and 52, Agrawal discloses each data stream is scaled with the weights and the weights are based on the received channel response estimate. This is shown in figure 1 steps 116 and 118. For these reasons and the reasons stated in the previous office action, the rejections of the claims are maintained.